R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 929 48

THE USE OF OBJECTIVE TESTS WITHIN INDIANA UNIVERSITY'S HONORS PROGRAM IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN 1962, 1963, AND 1964.

BY- MUNFORD, DAVID C.
INDIANA UNIV., BLOOMINGTON

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-52 PUB DATE 30 OCT 64
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.32 33P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LANGUAGE TESTS, *TESTING PROGRAMS, *HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, *HONORS CURRICULUM, SCREENING TESTS, LANGUAGE SKILLS, TEST INTERPRETATION, EVALUATION METHODS, *MODERN LANGUAGES, COOPERATIVE CLASSROOM PROFICIENCY TESTS, BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA, MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION'S "COOPERATIVE CLASSROOM PROFICIENCY TESTS" WERE USED IN THE CONDUCT AND DEVELOPMENT OF A MODERN LANGUAGE HONORS PROGRAM FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN INDIANA. THESE TESTS WERE USED IN (1) DETERMINING THE LANGUAGE LEARNING SITUATION IN THE STATE, (2) SELECTING THE POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE STUDENTS FOR THE HONORS PROGRAM, AND (3) EVALUATING PROGRAM PROGRESS AND SUCCESS. THE DESIGN OF THE TESTING PROCEDURE INVOLVED PRE-, POST-, AND POST-POST-TESTS. EVALUATIONS WERE MADE OF TEST SCORES, TESTING PROCEDURES, OBSERVED PARTICIPANT PROFICIENCIES, AND THE IMPACT OF TESTS ON THE HONORS PROGRAM. (RS)

ED003929

52

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION ...
Office of Education
...is document has been reproduced exactly as received from...
person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions
stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education
position or policy.

THE USE OF OBJECTIVE TESTS WITHIN INDIANA UNIVERSITY'S HONORS PROGRAM IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN 1962, 1963, AND 1964

Contractor: Indiana University

Principal Investigator: David C. Munford, Director

Honors Program in Foreign Languages
for High School Students

Part of the Testing Program reported upon herein was supported by the United States Office of Education under provision of Public Law 85-864, Title VI, Section 603 -- see Financial Report on page 24.

October 30, 1964

Preface

This is a report upon the use of the Modern Language Asscciation's new Cooperative Classroom Proficiency Tests for selections and for evaluation within Indiana University's Honors Program in Foreign Languages for High School Students. These tests, administered by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, were in part purchased from funds made available to us for that purpose by the United States Office of Education under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act, and some were drawn from our grants from the Carnegie Corporation and others, and from student fees. It would, however, be relatively meaningless for us to report here only upon that portion of the various testing administrations financed by USOE. We shall instead now report upon our use of all tests for all purposes. Further, we shall also summarize briefly the three-year story of the Honors Program in Foreign Languages for High School Students, in order to provide the context within which the use of the tests can be better understood.

The Honors Program

This program, like several others conducted by Indiana University, is intended to help secondary public and parochial schools in this state to expand and strengthen the teaching and learning of modern foreign languages. Specifically, it is designed to offer these schools a resource for developing community support for more effective language teaching in the schools, for increasing enrollments, for encouraging the development of speaking and listening skills, for developing longer teaching sequences, for demonstrating the value of previous preparation before overseas study, for encouraging individual student persistence beyond Level II work, and in general for imparting an air of reality to the task of learning language as a communication art. The particular device used for these general purposes was an intensive summer school abroad in each language, conducted on a merit selection basis and designed to bring each

participating Honors Student to a point of at least a practical command of his foreign language in its spoken form. Thus we are a foreign-study program only secondarily; primarily we are a language-impact program in the secondary schools of a single state.

This impact is developed in many ways. First, we present the program in the state in these terms, admitting to participation in it only schools prepared to cooperate with us in motivating towns, school boards, administrators, teachers, and students. In such schools the program's opportunities are explained by the school itself to all its students early in the year, every year, encouraging them to start preparing themselves for individual application to it early in their school careers. Since the study abroad offers unique opportunities for improving speaking and listening skills, and since we therefore concentrate upon these skills in selection and in teaching, cooperating schools tend to give these skills new emphasis in their regular classrooms. We feel this is a remarkable trend, especially because we learn not surprisingly that skills in reading and writing are affected advantageously by this increasing emphasis upon speaking and listening.

Most importantly of all, however, is the impact developed from the demonstration of fluency which our Honors Students acquire in this summer of extra effort. No word can describe what can happen in a fourth year class at home--indeed in first, second, and third year classes also--when the students who stayed at home see and hear for themselves how effectively other youngsters speak a foreign language. Suddenly it becomes clear to everyone that a foreign language can indeed be mastered, that this does not take as much extra effort as many have thought, that doing so is fun, and that it can also be rewarding in various ways. Essentially what we are doing is dramatizing the value of the three-year sequence all our Honors Student have completed. It is <u>not</u> true that one must go abroad to master a foreign language. It <u>is</u> true that once

the initial investment has been made it can be capitalized on only by extra effort. How this extra effort is to be made and what combination of classroom teaching, use of the laboratory, and practice outside the school is called for, is now being worked out in practice by our participating schools. In many of them it has now come down to this: Fourth-year students who did not participate in our program often become very nearly as fluent before they graduate as our Honors Student alumni. <u>This tends to happen especially in those schools where the teachers have carefully organized Honors Student alumni participation in these classrooms, deliberately using them for teaching purposes.</u>

Thus it is clear that to a very large extent the success of this program in developing positive impact on our real target group, the students who do not participate in the program, depends upon our success in attaining our working goal overseas. This is to bring every Honors Student to the level of practical command of his foreign language in its spoken form.

Please note: In order to avoid confusion of purposes, we say little about other purposes to be served by successful foreign study or travel. This does not mean that we are unaware of these values. Indeed, we hold that in the aggregate the by-products of value from a succeseful inter-cultural experience centering upon the exclusive use of the foreign language are greater than is the value of learning thoroughly a foreign language. We insist, however, that the latter is the key to the former. Students who believe that an experience abroad can be successful on some other basis are encouraged to enter other programs.

<u>The Honors Program in Indiana</u>

Any public or parochial school in this state offering a four-year sequence (without combined classes) in any of our three languages (French, German, and Spanish) is elibible to particpate in the program. Our insistence

upon the separate fourth-year class is because this is the class within which our fluent and enthusiastic Honors Student alumni are to play their service roles as demonstrators, motivators, and occasionally as teaching assistants of the near-native informant type.

From these schools applicants for inclusion in the program as Honors Students are selected on a merit basis with classroom achievement in speaking skills an important criterion. Also considered in selection are the applicant's general academic record , his health, his apparent stability and maturity (for his age), his motivation for language learning, and his citizenship record. All semi-final applicants are interviewed. The applicant's ability to pay is <u>not</u> considered for selection purposes. Our selection committee acts prior to and independently of the granting of financial assistance. The student finally selected pays a fee for his participation in the program sufficiently high to give him and his parents some pause, an important step in self-selection.

Up to thirty Honors Student can be selected in each language for each summer session. Once these selections have been completed, students who need financial assistance in order to participate are invited to apply. Our approach here is unusual, possibly unique. We undertake to provide every student who asks for it the amount of financial assistance which seems required in his case. We determine the specific amount in each case, using for this purpose the techniques and materials developed by the College Scholarship Service of the College Entrance Examination Board. Thus we arrive at a net price to be paid by each student not so high as to call for undue sacrifice on the one hand and not so low on the other as to confuse the under-motivated applicant.

The maximum price for participation in the program is $950 for the ten-week sessions in France or Germany and $650 for the six-week session in Mexico. About a third of our students prove able to pay this maximum. Our minimum is $100.

The Honors Program Abroad

In Mexico in 1962, and in France and Germany in all three years, we created and conducted our own schools. This was done in each case by a master secondary teacher of the language recruited for this purpose. Each such teacher was encouraged to develop and follow whatever teaching plan he wished, provided only that he was committed wholeheartedly to our working goal--achievement for each Honors Student of the highest possible skills in the use of the spoken language. The chief elements in each teacher's plan were virtually identical. All recruited and trained native informants or assistants and were provided opportunities to travel to the study town in advance for this purpose.

Emphasis was upon aural-oral skills; audio-lingual techniques were used. There was a close relationship between teaching and the students' lives in the town. In all countries school was conducted for approximately five hours a day, for five, five and a half, or six days a week. School began on the first day after arrival in the town and met for the last time on the last day before departure.

Each student lived with a native family.

All Honors Students, the Honors Program staff, and all host families were pledged to speak no English at any time for any purpose throughout the summer. We consider the successful application of this system primary to our purposes and are unrelenting on the point.

In Mexico in 1962 and in France and Germany in all three years we stayed all summer in a single study town remote from the beaten tourist track. Field trips for teaching purposes were in the locality; no other touring was done.

Each summer session lasted for ten weeks in 1962. In France and in Germany this was reduced to nine weeks in 1963 and 1964.

In Mexico we felt obliged to take an altogether different approach in 1963 and 1964. This was because of problems of health control and of responsibility for the well-being of our teen-age girls. Our summer sessions there have been conducted since 1962 in cooperation with the regularly offered summer program of the Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores in Monterrey. This is a six-week session conducted by their regular teaching staff entirely in Spanish, also involving a five-hour daily curriculum. Several hundred other American studencsat both college and high school levels also attend this summer session, and we therefore organized, with the help of the Instituto, a special Spanish language-house for our Honors Student girls. Mexican roommates were assigned to our Honors Student boys in the regular dormitories of the Instituto.

231 Honors Students have been selected and trained in this fashion in our first three years. All spent at least a year in their home high schools following their return from these summer sessions. All continued in the advanced study of their foreign language during that time and all were theoretically to have been used in service to other students of the language in those classrooms. Many have now graduated and are in college, a significant number of these being freshmen and sophomores at Indiana University now.

The devotion of these alumni to the languages they have mastered, to the culture of which these languages are the important key, and to the program itself is overwhelming. From our side it would be hard to overstate our admiration for them and the age group they represent. These Honors Students are by no means an elite group academically, it must be emphasized. So far as class standings and academic scores reveal, we are drawing these students from only the upper half of their school classes. Only in the area of character and motivation do we seek the clearly superior youngsters, and in this area it is hard to say how successful we have been. The fact is, however, that in their response to the very rigorous challenge of this intensive program of hard work

in pursuit of a goal important to them but always just beyond their grasp--real mastery of a foreign language--they have vindicated our conviction that high school students of today are hungry for just such challenges. Our relationship with these students continues after they return home because they keep in touch with us voluntarily. Invariably they recommend more school work overseas rather than less, greater emphasis in briefing upon the central importance of never speaking any English while in the foreign country, and so on. As a result, we now use student alumni almost exclusively in briefing our new Honors Students on Orientation and Departure Day.

Testing

The use of the MLA Cooperative Classroom Proficiency Tests has been central in the conduct and development of this program from the outset. To begin with we needed some test scores for informal research purposes, chiefly in order to appraise the language learning situation in the state in general, before beginning our program. We then needed to test for selection. Finally, we wished to do some evaluation in order to determine how successful we were in reaching our working objectives abroad. There now follows a report upon the use of tests for these three purposes.

Testing for Selection

On February 5, 1962, all potentially eligible students in participating schools were tested. First, we wanted to know as much as possible about the skill levels being reached in third year classes in our heterogeneous group of schools, in order to be able to plan a viable selection system for the summer of 1962 and for succeeding summers. Second, we needed individual scores in order to complete whatever selection process was decided upon for 1962. After 1962 we tested only applicants, (on March 11, 1963, and on January 27, 1964) and for selection only, using the system of selection we had developed in 1962.

In more detail, the tests were used for the above purposes in the following way.

In 1962 we first tested all Juniors or below, in third-year classes or above, in French, German and Spanish in the 31 high schools who were then participating in the program (50 now participate). 708 students were tested, of whom 259 were in French, 163 in German, and 286 in Spanish. Form A of the Lower Level MLA Cooperative Classroom Tests was used in all cases, but only listening, reading, and speaking were tested. We did not test writing because it seemed to us that this would be relatively less useful for selection in a program emphasizing aural-oral skills; the relatively high cost of the writing

test was also a factor. The Educational Testing Service scored all tests and delivered the final data to us in several forms including composite scores for various skills in combination. Unfortunately we had failed to order a composite score of listening and speaking skills.

These test scores revealed a nice distribution in the three language groups in all three skills. They also made quite clear that our earlier assumption of major differences between the effectiveness of teaching at the third-year level in different schools was a sound one. This range of differences was extreme. To cite the most extreme example, there are listed below the range of scores in the three skills in the two schools most widely differing in one language.

	School X - Level III	School Y - Level III
Speaking (Maximum possible 113)	22 - 51	52 - 91
Listening (Maximum possible 50)	9 - 28	33 - 47
Reading (Maximum possible 50)	7 - 25	33 - 48

In such a situation, and assuming an important place for skill scores among criteria for selection, any school quota system in student selection seemed to us to be ruled out. The less well-prepared students from School Y would automatically have been excluded from consideration in competition with the best of those from School X, though virtually all of the former were ready to achieve maximum gains in our summer session.[1] Aside from this point of equity in a merit competition in a program relying upon merit selection as a primary source of motivation, we did not wish to present our master teachers overseas

---

1. It is pleasant to report that the teachers concerned in School X have been highly successful since 1962 in using the Honors Program as a device for motivating and upgrading the skills of all their students of this language in Level I, II, III, and IV classes. In both 1963 and 1964 applicants from their Level III classes scored around the mean score of all applicants in the state in speaking skills, and in both years at least one applicant from this language in this school succeeded in winning in the final competition.

with a serious problem of heterogeneity of previous preparation. Finally, it seemed to us self-evident that the limited and expensive opportunity we were prepared to offer in our summer sessions overseas should in logic go to those who would draw the greatest profit from it, regardless of home school location.

There seemed to us to be little correlation between scores in reading and those in speaking. There was more correlation between listening scores and speaking scores although less than we had thought there would be. For these reasons, and again because aural-oral skills were central to our purpose, we decided not to use reading scores in selection. We also decided somewhat pragmatically to weight speaking skills over listening skills on the ratio of 2:1; on this basis we drew up our own composite speaking-listening score list. Again somewhat pragmatically, if not arbitrarily, we designated approximately the top third of each such list as eligible to apply for inclusion in our program if they wished to do so. Almost all did apply.

From this point forward test scores became a relatively minor factor in selection. We used them in the following way. In each language we considered every applicant whose score fell in the top third of the eligible group to have a "plus" factor in his favor. The score of each eligible student in the middle third of the score list was ignored. The score of each student in the bottom third of the eligible group was considered a "minus" factor. For example, the screening committee tended to allow a "plus" score to compensate at least somewhat for a weak academic transcript in other subjects, or any apparent listlessness or lack of motivation (which had obviously not prevented the student from excelling in language). On the other hand, a "minus" score needed to be compensated for at least somewhat by strength in some other criterion for selection, such as marks in the language class or apparently strong motivation, etc.

This system was subjected to fairly heavy scrutiny when the summer of 1962 had been completed and we were in a position to compare actual experiences

and classroom observations with screening committee impressions at selection time. For the most part, the value of this self-criticism lay largely in the area of non-academic factors in selection. Where test scores were concerned, only the following was clear:

First, speaking scores turned out to be more important than listening scores for selection purposes. To overstate the case somewhat, but probably not too much, the student who can say a few words but understand almost none when they are spoken is a better investment for intensive and expensive language training abroad than the student who can understand something of what is being said to him, but who can say nothing. As a result, we decided to use only speaking scores for selection purposes.

Second, our cut-off point in speaking scores for selection purposes appeared in retrospect to have been too low. This had not resulted in the lowest students in each group failing to become reasonably fluent while overseas, but it had had the effect of creating tensions within the host families and sometimes within the student group. In the host-families, in these cases, the Honors Students utter inability to communicate for the first two or three weeks, with everybody concerned struggling to maintain the "no-English" pledge at the same time, led to the loss of a few families for future years. Within the student groups these weakest students tended to associate with one another and to find opportunities for the private use of English.

In 1963 we tested only students who had already decided to apply for the program. For this purpose we used Form A of the Higher Level MLA Cooperative Classroom Test in Speaking only. We used the Higher Level instead of the Lower because we felt that the scores on the Higher Level test used for the pretest in 1962 (for evaluative purposes) had offered us a better basis for determining a new cut-off point. On the 113 point scale this new cut-off point was 47 in French, 49 in German and 51 in Spanish, a raise of 2 points in French, 8 points

in German, and 11 points in Spanish. The effect of this lifting of the cut-off point was, however, not to reduce the percentage of eligible applicants but to increase it. Clearly, the skill levels of applicants to us in the second year were significantly higher than those in the first. This occurred again even more sharply in our third year. Although the writer of this report would like to be able to conclude that the Honors Program itself was responsible for this upgrading, it seems clear that there are too many other factors going into this upgrading trend in this state for any such conclusion to be warranted.

In 1964 this 1963 system for using the MLA-ETS tests in selection was repeated. Cut-off points were again raised, but only slightly, and again the percentage of students thus made ineligible was sharply lowered. In German, as a matter of fact, less than 5% were thus excluded in 1964. It is clear that as this program continues we may be confronted with a severe problem of greatly expanding numbers of academically eligible applicants.

We now conclude that objective outside testing is indispensable for selection in this program. However, experience and observation overseas may have freed us from the necessity for using the MLA-ETS Cooperative Classroom Tests for this purpose in the future. Our American overseas staff and many of our Honors Student alumni are now in a position to determine fairly quickly and reliably in direct conversation with a student applicant (1) whether or not he is ready to profit adequately from the program, and (2) whether he is ready or not to at least begin a successful homestay experience on an entirely foreign language basis. We are therefore considering devising a new system for selection insofar as speaking skills are concerned, relying primarily upon the trained competence of a personal interviewer in the foreign language.

Testing For Evaluation

It is important to note that the MLA-ETS Proficiency Tests used do not undertake to measure proficiency directly. They offered us a basis for doing so only indirectly -- by comparing the scores of the group tested (whose skills were unknown to us) with the scores of other groups, (whose skills were also unknown to us). Thus we were not relieved of the obligation of deciding for ourselves in direct dealings with our Honors Students where their language skills fall on some usable English language scale, such as that prepared years ago by the Modern Language Association for the use of employers of teachers (see Appendix A).

Below is our summary report on our use of the MLA-ETS tests for evaluative purposes followed by a summary report on our own independent estimations of these skills.

We planned originally to use the MLA-ETS Proficiency Tests for the 1962 group in the following way.[2] First, we were to test all Honors Students in all four skills on the first day of the summer program in mid-June (Pretest). Second, we were to test them again in all four skills on the program's final day in late August (Posttest). Third, we were to test them once again in all four skills in late spring following their completion of anocher year of advanced language study in their home high schools (Post-posttest). As our chief need was for a measure of progress by the group rather than for that by individuals, the test plan was devised accordingly.

The test used was the MLA-ETS Cooperative Classroom Proficiency Test,

---

2. Indiana University is deeply indebted to the Educational Testing Service for having made tests available to us,for this and other purposes, as we were developing this program. At that time the tests were still in their developmental stage and ETS might well have preferred to withhold them until that process had been completed. They did, however, work as closely with us as though this program had been their own, at a time when that effort from their side must have been particularly difficult. We are grateful.

Higher Level, then available to us under the special arrangement referred to in note two, in three independent forms, A, B, and C, each covering all four skills. We were to divide each language groups into thirds, using Form A in all four skills for the first group in each language for the Pretest, Form B for the second group, and Form C for the third. For the Posttest, we were to shift to Form B for the first group in each language, Form C for the second group, and Form A for the third. For the Post-posttest one school year later we were to shift again using Form C for the first group, Form A for the second and B for the third. Thus each group within each language would have been tested three separate times with three separate forms.

It was our understanding that this would provide a fairly reliable measure of the progress of the group as a whole during the summer and again during the following year; and at the same time a basis for comparing our group with other Level III and Level IV groups of high school students outside the state of Indiana to which all three forms of the same tests had been administered by ETS in order to provide normative data in other connections. Finally, it was our understanding that used in <u>this</u> way, these tests would <u>not</u> provide a reliable measure of progress by individual students; for this reason we have never reported these scores to individual students.

<u>Please Note</u>: The third test (Post-posttest referred to above (to have been administered to our Honors Student group in the spring following a full school year at home) was not given because of unavoidable limitation of budget and staff time. Consequently we have no test score measure of progress during that school year. The first and second tests (Pretest and Posttest) were given as planned.

Evaluation of Progress according to Test Scores

The results of the test administration as it actually transpired in 1962 is summarized in Table A. Normative data on high school students outside the state of Indiana is summarized in Tables C, D, and E. These tables were prepared for us by the Educational Testing Service.

These tests were administered by the staff of the Language Laboratory at Indiana University. All students took them at the same time in identical conditions. All scoring in all skills was done by ETS in Princeton.

In the judgment of this program's directors, the results of the test administration described above and other direct evidence of the language proficiencies attained by our Honors Students in our special summer schools, were such as to relieve us of the necessity for repeating evaluative testing every year. However, we did do the following in 1963. First, we used the speaking scores attained at selection time (mid-March 1963) by those who later turned out to be our final Honors Students as a pretest of their speaking skills. Second, we again tested all Honors Students in all four skills on the program's final day. For the combined selection and evaluative pretest in speaking only we used Form A of the Higher Level MLA-ETS Cooperative Classroom Proficiency Test; for the evaluative posttest in all four skills, we used Form C of the same test.

The results of this second evaluative test administration for 1963 appear in Table B, prepared for us by ETS. It provides a basis for comparing our 1963 final results (1) with those of 1962, and (2) with the normative data which appears in Tables C,D, and E. It also again makes it possible to compare the Honors Student group with itself on a pretest and posttest basis at least in speaking skills. However, it should be noted in this connection that the period of time between pretest and posttest in 1963 was over twice as great as that in 1962, and some of this time was spent in the home class rooms before the

intensive summer began.

In 1964 there was no evaluative testing.

Comment on Evaluative Test Scores

Because the 1962 test administration covered all four skills on both pre-test and posttest, and was for the ten-week summer program only, it is the most useful for evaluating the progress in the program of our group, as a group, either by comparing the group with itself on a before and after basis, or by comparing it with both the third year norms and fourth year norms as provided by ETS from outside the state of Indiana. These data speak for themselves for the most part, but the writer's own comments follow.

Insofar as these scores are valid for comparison purposes, it would appear that the intensive summer did raise our Honors Students well beyond proficiency levels usually reached in an additional fourth-year of study at home. For example, referring to French in Tables A and C, the Honors Students' scores at the summer's end are well beyond those of fourth-year students at home (see below).

	Norms			Honors Students 1962		
	Maximum possible	3rd year	4th year	Gain	3rd year	After summer	Gain
Listening	50	25.2	29.5	4.3	28.1	41.7	13.6
Speaking	113	54.1	59.6	5.5	57.6	80.7	23.2
Reading	50	25.6	30.7	5.1	29.3	37.3	8.0
Writing	123	62.3	69.7	7.4	68.9	87.8	18.9

In comparing these gains it should be noted that in the test scale used, many Honors Students had less room than needed in which to show progress. For example several Honors Students began the summer with listening scores in the 40's on the ETS 1-50 scale, and, quite naturally, ended in the 40's also. In other words there was a score grouping at the ceiling in the test of this skill. To a lesser extent this seems to have occurred in the other skills in all three languages.

In all languages the gains in writing skills are interesting. It must be remembered that emphasis in all three summer schools was upon speaking and listening. In Spanish this amounted that year to almost exclusive concentration upon these skills; pratically no reading or writing was done in the classroom process there. Some reading and writing was done in both the French and German classrooms but primarily as a supplement to the basically audio-lingual approach used by our American master teachers in all three countries. Thus it would appear that effective concentration upon speaking and listening skills raises writing skills comparably and almost automatically, and that reading skills are also upgraded significantly.

Reactions to these writing scores at Indiana University and by some of our teaching staff in France, Germany and Mexico has also revealed to the writer of this report that this unusual rise in the virtually untaught writing skills surprised almost everyone concerned. A common assumption appears to be that writing skills are both the most difficult to impart and the last to be acquired. This may not be so. Actually a youngster who speaks well and easily,and who can spell, can write what he says as easily as he can say it; he is dealing only with vocabulary and syntax which he already controls effectively. The same cannot be said for reading.[3]

In transmitting to us the results of the test administration for evaluative purposes in 1962, the Educational Testing Service called attention to one phenome-

---

3. We always urge our Honors Student alumni to read widely in the year following their return from our summer schools overseas. In a few cases this appears to have led to voluntary classes or groupings in a few of our cooperating high schools wherein our students discuss in their foreign language some book which they have all brought back from abroad for this purpose. In one such case their language teacher was later invited by such a group to join them und ultimately this group was installed in the curriculum of the school as a Level V class.

non, apparently unusual in their experience, in the following terms:

> With respect to the program as a whole, the data gives the impression that it was most successful. For six of the twelve test comparisons, every individual had a higher score on the posttest than the mean score in the pretest. For the other six tests, only thirteen posttest scores were lower than the comparable pretest mean.

This letter then goes on to say:

> For the twelve test comparisons the average mean gain was 1.3 times the size of the standard deviation of the most appropriate reference group. Every test comparison but one showed a mean gain greater than the standard deviation of the reference group. All three of the language groups showed exceptional gains on the combination of four tests.
>
> We extend congratulations to you, to the members of your teaching staff, and to each of your 1962 honors students on the outstanding accomplishment of all language groups.

In transmitting the results of our 1963 test administration ETS said:

> Once again it is a pleasure to report scores which give evidence of such spectacular achievement on the part of all three language groups. Since only the Speaking test was used in the selection phase of the program this year, our test scores furnish measurable evidence of growth only in that skill. However, since the posttest mean scores on tests in all skills are at least one standard deviation above the mean scores for our third-year pretest groups and for some tests approximately two standard deviations above the mean scores for our third-year pretest groups, one cannot help but read evidence of growth in all skills.
>
> The mean posttest scores, with only two or three exceptions, place the Indiana groups above the 90th percentiles for individual third-year students in our pretest groups. Of the 272 separate scores obtained in the posttesting, only six fell below average scores for third-year pretest groups, and one of the six was the result of mechanical difficulties in tape recording.

Independent Evaluations of Actual Proficiencies

In summary, it would seem that almost all our Honors Students in French and German in all three years, and in Spanish in 1962, finished their summer session speaking their foreign language, and understanding it when it was spoken, at least at the level characterized as "Good" in Appendix A. Exceptions to this generalization tend to be upward. We know of no Honors Student who could be said to have attained less than the speaking and listening skills characterized as

"Minimum". The situation in Spanish in 1963 and 1964 is commented on separately a little later in this report (see page 20).

The principal basis for this assertion lies, quite naturally, in our own observation of our Honors Students' aural-oral activity while abroad. They are quite clearly able "to understand conversation at average tempo, lectures, and news broadcasts" because they do exactly that every day, week after week, during the summer's second half. Similarly, they show themselves in the native setting as able "to sustain conversation with natives on a variety of subjects, speaking at normal speed with good pronunciation and intonation". In every country a few of the best of our students are occasionally mistaken for natives by natives; thus it seems clear that a few come to "approximate native speech in vocabulary, pronunciation, and intonation".

At home the Honors Students' own teachers, or other teachers or natives with whom they come in contact, can see for themselves without help from us what the Honors Students' aural-oral skills actually are. In addition we always try to arrange for a student demonstration when one of our staff members is asked to speak to groups about the program. What we do in such instances is to report only briefly, then turn the program over to a student alumni panel (preferably two or more in each language), asking the audience to discuss the program with <u>them only in their foreign language</u>. When necessary we have supplied native speakers to the audience for this question asking. In such circumstances it becomes clear fairly quickly that the students are quite able to control their foreign language in response to and in discussion of unanticipated questions. This requires skills in listening and speaking at at least the level of "Good", and offers an opportunity to demonstrate under pressure skills above that level. No alumnus or alumna of the thirty or so thus used so far has failed to perform well; many have been impressively "Superior"; all were drawn more or less at random, usually for geographical reasons, from the score groups. We have delib-

erately avoided only alumni who seemed to us particularly vulnerable to stage fright.

We have less basis in evidence for independent value judgments about the skill levels of these students in reading and writing. The writer would guess, however, that their writing skills are approximately at the level of "Good" as defined in the Appendix. He bases this upon the judgment of professionals here to whom he has shown correspondence received from the students in their foreign language after their return. He also bases this upon the judgment of our foreign cooperators and hosts with whom these students almost inevitably carry on continuing correspondence in the year and years following their return from abroad.

Naturally, all the above refers to the student's ability to handle his language as a teen-ager. No one is able to discuss subjects in either English or a foreign language about which he knows nothing.

Our appraisal of the skills in speaking, listening, reading and writing acquired by our Honors Students in Spanish in 1963 and 1964 must be and is somewhat tenuous. The learning opportunity of these students is significantly less than that of their counterparts in Europe or of their predecessors in our independent program in Oaxaca, Mexico. The summer session in Monterrey is shorter, involves only a minor cultural-immersion factor, and has to be conducted within the predominantly English-speaking environment which seems to be inevitable in even the best regular summer schools overseas attended by hundreds of Americans "to learn the language". The Instituto Tecnologico at Monterrey cooperated fully with us in creating a special Honors Program within their regular summer program, and our students in both years did the best they could to speak Spanish exclusively while there. The Instituto's teaching was in Spanish and was excellent. Our Honors Program's leadership was superior and the morale of the group seemed high at all times.

The learning results of all this were significant; according to the

Spanish test scores (see Table B) it might even be said to have compared favorably with the learning results in our earlier independent program in Mexico and in all three years in France and Germany. The Honors Student alumni in Spanish whom we have used as panelists in student demonstrations have also acquitted themselves well.

However, it has seemed clear to the writer of this report that there have been significant differences between the skills of our 1963-64 Spanish students and the others, differences possibly not measurable by test. These differences are in ease of control, in personal confidence about that control, and in inclination toward the exercise of skill. For example, while returning from Europe our French and German alumni speak <u>only</u> their foreign language to each other on the plane and elsewhere without apparently giving this matter any thought. Their confrontation with English upon arrival in Bloomington is always a shock, and their ability to use English is clearly impeded then and for the following several days. When they rejoin one another in school or in reunions throughout the year they again tend to speak the foreign language in which they came to know one another; this happens almost invariably.

Where the 1963 and 1964 Spanish students are concerned there has been some occurrence of all these phenomena, but on the whole it can be said that none of them occurs in anything like the same way. They themselves tended to draw a conscious distinction between their skills and those of their French and German counterparts. They believe that they are less competent and in practice they act on that belief.

Nevertheless, the Honors Students of Spanish are able before the summer session in Monterrey is over to do such things as attend Spanish movies and understand lectures in the same way, and to get around with fair ease in the city of Monterrey. Perhaps both they and the writer underestimate their skills.

General Impact at Home

What of our accomplishments to date in the area of our ultimate purpose--positive impact at home?

Unfortunately we have no specific measures in this important area. It should be borne in mind also that we originally planned to develop this general impact over a five year period. Nevertheless, some tentative interim conclusions can be drawn.

In the first place, it turned out in 1960 that although many schools were listed in state-wide statistics as offering four-year sequences in French, German or Spanish there were actually only about a half dozen such sequences in any language with fourth-year classes separately scheduled and taught. Almost always the fourth-year student sat with a third-year class. In order to get started, we admitted to participation in this program all such schools on the condition that in the year following they would offer fourth-year work independently. Now, three years later, we have fifty participating schools with genuine four-year sequences in one, two or three languages, approximately a fifteen-fold increase.

We also lack at this time reliable statistics on enrollment increase patterns in language classes at all levels, particularly at those points which interest us most, as for example, at the point of transition from second to third year classes. However, a general upward surge is clearly evident, reflecting itself for example in very pressing demands upon us for assistance in teacher recruitment. In schools which have participated in our program from the beginning, there appears to have been a several-fold increase in enrollments in third-year classes, judging from the scattered statistics we draw from these schools at the time of student application. Unfortunately we did not systematize this process of statistic gathering for reporting purposes. And, again, many other factors besides the Honors Program in Foreign Languages for High School Students have been working toward such increases.

In the more important area of the upgrading of skills in participating schools we also lack data. A useful and interesting test project would be to compare fourth-year students (excluding our Honors Student Alumni) in our participating schools with those in fourth-year classes elsewhere. Using the normative data in Tables C,D, and E as a base point, and administering to our "stay-at-home" students the higher level tests used by ETS to secure that normative data, we would have an interesting measure of the upgrading of skills resulting from the use in any classrooms of our Honors Students as student leaders.

A few high school situations better known to us than others suggest that this upgrading effect has been strong. For example, a representative of the French government visited Thomas Carr Howe High School in Indianapolis to inspect on the spot the apparent effect of our program there. In their fourth-year class of 16 students, only three of whom were our alumni, our French visitor could not be sure which of the fairly fluent 16 were these alumni. In a similar visit for the same purpose by a German governmental representative at Hammond High School in Hammond, Indiana, the impression he gained was also that the high skill levels of students in fourth- and fifth-year classes who had not studied overseas were comparable to those of the students who had. In a dozen other of our participating schools less direct but highly suggestive evidence suggests that similar developments are occuring. Naturally, this tends to happen in the school which deliberately organizes itself for this purpose. More follow-through in this area is badly needed.

Financial

The total cost of testing in this program to date has been $21,965.83 as itemized below:

Paid to the Educational Testing Service for tests, test shipments, and scoring services.	$20,085.83
Salaries	1,516.24
Supplies	65.62
Travel	53.14
General Administration (overhead)	245.00
Total expenditures	$21,965.83

Of these costs, $14,370.00 were supplied by the U.S. Office of Education under the U.S.O.E. contract # OE 2-14-0111, under which expenditures are itemized below.

Expenditures
January 2, 1962 - June 10, 1962

Salaries	$ 1,516.24
Supplies	65.62
Travel	53.14
Paid to the Educational Testing Service for tests, test shipments, and scoring services	12,490.00
Overhead	245.00
Total expenditures	$14,370.00

TABLE A

INDIANA UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Summary Statistics for Pretesting and Posttesting, June and August, 1962

Language	Test	Maximum possible score	Third Year Norms		Indiana Statistics				
			Range of means	Mean Sigma	Pretest range	Pretest mean	Posttest range	Posttest mean	Pre-to-Post gain*
French	Listening	50	24.3-26.3	7.8	19-38	28.1	29.47	41.7	13.6
	Speaking	113	51.3-57.9	13.8	45-75	57.6	69-91	80.7	23.2
	Reading	50	22.7-27.1	7.8	12-44	29.3	21-45	37.3	8.0
	Writing	123	55.9-66.6	16.1	40-98	68.9	57-112	87.8	18.9
German	Listening	50	28.8-33.4	9.4	19-46	30.4	41-50	46.0	15.6
	Speaking	113	48.5-60.6	14.9	41-96	54.1	56-104	74.9	20.8
	Reading	50	19.7-21.8	8.1	11-32	19.8	19-45	32.0	12.3
	Writing	123	55.9-62.4	16.3	30-88	56.0	58-100	79.0	23.0
Spanish	Listening	50	18.9-23.9	7.6	15-45	30.8	37-49	42.5	11.7
	Speaking	113	57.3-59.3	15.4	40-108	68.0	64-112	88.9	20.8
	Reading	50	18.1-20.4	6.4	15-38	26.8	20-38	29.8	3.0
	Writing	123	53.1-60.9	19.6	33-109	73.2	65-118	94.3	21.0

*Minor discrepancies in difference between pretest and posttest means and gains reported are the result of rounding all three statistics to one decimal place.

TABLE B

INDIANA UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Summary Statistics for Pretesting and Posttesting, March and August, 1963

Language	Test	Maximum Possible Score	Third Year Norms Mean Scores (1)	Indiana Statistics				
				Pretest Range	Pretest Mean	Posttest Range	Posttest Mean	Pre-to Post-Gain
French	Listening	50	25.2			25 - 49	42.0	
	Speaking	113	54.1	47 - 85	61.1	70 - 95	80.4	19.3
	Reading	50	25.6			22 - 47	34.5	
	Writing	123	62.3			51 - 109	81.6	
German	Listening	50	31.0			42 - 50	45.6	
	Speaking	113	53.6	49 - 78	61.8	59 - 96	77.3	15.5
	Reading	50	20.9			21 - 42	33.7	
	Writing	123	58.9			60 - 109	87.3	
Spanish	Listening	50	21.7			30 - 45	36.3	
	Speaking	113	58.0	51 - 77	61.0	70 - 90	80.3	19.3
	Reading	50	18.8			20 - 36	28.2	
	Writing	123	58.2			70 - 117	86.6	

(1) Same as 1962, but averaged by ETS in this Table.

Table C

MLA - Cooperative Classroom Tests

Summary Statistics - Test Development Program

FRENCH

Higher Level - Third Year of Study

Test	Form	No. Cases	Mean	Sigma
Listening Comprehension	A	183	26.32	8.75
	B	87	24.93	6.52
	C	148	24.30	8.28
			Av. 25.2	
Speaking	A	192	57.90	16.86
	B	105	53.28	11.62
	C	120	51.26	12.80
			Av. 54.1	
Reading	A	150	27.14	8.34
	B	132	27.11	7.94
	C	139	22.68	7.24
			Av. 25.6	
Writing	A	161	66.56	17.88
	B	46	65.22	17.17
	C	31	55.94	13.32
			Av. 62.3	

Higher Level - Fourth Year of Study

Listening Comprehension	A	107	27.75	8.00
	B	190	30.44	7.30
	C	78	30.32	8.19
			Av. 29.5	
Speaking	A	86	59.33	13.96
	B	168	59.73	15.26
	C	108	59.82	14.56
			Av. 59.6	
Reading	A	138	30.90	8.60
	B	122	33.08	7.27
	C	135	28.14	7.43
			Av. 30.7	
Writing	A	76	68.37	16.54
	B	93	71.96	14.98
	C	56	68.66	13.53
			Av. 69.7	

Table D

MLA - Cooperative Classroom Tests

Revised Summary Statistics - Test Development Program

GERMAN

Lower Lever - First and Second Years of Study

Test	Form	No. Cases	Mean	Sigma
Listening Comprehension	A	361	26.90	9.09
	B	247	25.36	9.35
	C	310	27.49	9.58
			Av. 26.6	
Speaking	A	290	55.21	11.71
	B	317	55.94	11.96
	C	322	60.00	13.64
			Av. 57.1	
Reading	A	449	25.37	9.41
	B	343	22.61	8.16
	C	344	24.86	8.32
			Av. 24.3	
Writing	A	462	68.11	19.43
	B	341	62.78	18.43
	C	347	65.12	18.33
			Av. 65.3	

Higher Level - Third and Fourth Years of Study

Listening Comprehension	A	334	30.68	9.42
	B	284	28.85	9.33
	C	245	33.42	9.30
			Av. 31.0	9.40
Speaking	A	140	51.51	15.59
	B	178	48.54	12.43
	C	189	60.63	16.57
			Av. 53.6	14.90
Reading	A	278	19.70	7.34
	B	187	20.30	8.03
	C	195	21.80	8.98
			Av. 20.9	8.10
Writing	A	249	55.90	17.46
	B	171	58.50	15.52
	C	213	62.40	15.79
			Av. 58.9	16.30

Table E

MLA - Cooperative Classroom Tests

Summary Statistics - Test Development Program

SPANISH

Higher Level - Third Year of Study

Test	Form	No. Cases	Mean	Sigma
Listening Comprehension	A	87	18.87	8.13
	B	92	23.87	7.85
	C	133	22.36	6.93
			Av. 21.7	
Speaking	A	137	59.27	18.65
	B	127	57.28	14.15
	C	150	57.45	13.35
			Av. 58.0	
Reading	A	123	18.07	6.46
	B	112	20.40	6.63
	C	108	18.08	6.18
			Av. 18.8	
Writing	A	129	60.85	21.66
	B	107	60.73	21.58
	C	85	53.09	15.54
			Av. 58.2	

Higher Level - Fourth Year of Study

Listening Comprehension	A	117	24.44	6.74
	B	80	29.44	7.45
	C	102	31.18	10.23
			Av. 28.4	
Speaking	A	141	65.58	17.02
	B	144	65.90	14.59
	C	92	65.34	16.13
			Av. 65.6	
Reading	A	100	24.01	7.62
	B	92	24.12	6.42
	C	102	26.76	9.25
			Av. 25.C	
Writing	A	155	71.86	18.50
	B	56	68.61	21.17
	C	87	73.55	24.27
			Av. 71.3	

Appendix A

COMPETENCE	SUPERIOR	GOOD	MINIMAL
Listening Comprehension	Ability to follow closely and with ease all types of standard speech, such as rapid or group conversation and mechanically transmitted speech.	Ability to understand conversation of normal tempo, lectures, and news broadcasts.	Ability to get the sense of what an educated native says when he is making a special effort to be understood and when he is speaking on a general and familiar subject.
Speaking	Ability to speak fluently, approximating native speech in vocabulary, intonation, and pronunciation. Ability to exchange ideas and to be at ease in social situations.	Ability to talk with a native without making glaring mistakes and with a command of vocabulary and syntax sufficient to express one's thoughts in conversation at normal speed with reasonably good pronunciation.	Ability to read aloud and to talk on prepared topics (e.g., for classroom situations) without obvious faltering, and to use the common expressions needed for getting around in the foreign country, speaking with a pronunciation understandable to a native.
Reading	Ability to read almost as easily as in English material of considerable difficulty.	Ability to read with immediate comprehension prose and verse of average difficulty and mature content.	Ability to grasp directly (i.e. without translating) the meaning of simple non-technical prose, except for an occasional word.
Writing	Ability to write on a variety of subjects with idiomatic naturalness, ease of expression, and some feeling for the style of the language.	Ability to write a simple "free composition" such as a letter, with clarity and correctness in vocabulary, idiom, and syntax.	Ability to write correctly sentences or paragraphs such as would be developed orally for classroom situations and to write a simple description or message without glaring errors.